

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 161

JC 820 419

AUTHOR Farland, Ronald; Carey, Diane
TITLE Child Development Programs in California Community Colleges: Status Report.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 20p.; Prepared as part of a background briefing of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Fresno, CA, September 16-17, 1982).
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Care Occupations; *Child Development; *Child Development Centers; Community Colleges; *Day Care Centers; Educational Legislation; Laboratory Schools; Program Evaluation; State Agencies; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

Background information is provided on child development programs and services in California community colleges. First, the report outlines the current status of child development centers and the three kinds of centers currently operated (i.e., lab schools, child care programs, and combination programs); the number and types of centers in operation; the children and families served by the centers; and the characteristics and adequacy of the centers. Next, a discussion of the status of child development instruction programs includes a definition of these programs and examines the relationship between child development instruction and services, the certificate/degree options, the number of colleges offering programs, and student enrollment levels. Then, a rationale is provided for the continued development of programs and services based on a recent court case mandating such services; the need to promote gender equity and to create programs for displaced homemakers and women re-entry students; the role of such services in promoting affirmative action and equal educational opportunities for minority students; and the practical opportunities provided to child development students, faculty, and staff. Following a discussion of funding sources, the roles of three state agencies in child development programs and services are considered. Finally, the charge of the Child Development Task Force in making policy recommendations is presented. (HB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

G. Hayward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
September 16-17, 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

□ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

■ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Title: Child Development Programs in California
Community Colleges - Status Report

Staff Presentation: Ronnald Farland, Administrator
Diane Carey, Specialist
College Services Unit

Summary

This background briefing item contains essential information Board members will need to set future policy directions for child development programs.

Child care and development centers for the children of community college students have grown in size and number substantially in the last decade. These services have become a vital element of educational access as higher percentages of women and minorities enroll in community colleges and enter the work force. In addition, community colleges in California play a significant role in the task of training teachers in child development, educating parents and potential parents, and setting up model child development centers which demonstrate ideal practices in early childhood education.

Child development programs in community colleges face a number of problems and needs, however. These include the need for stable and adequate operational funding, clarification of licensing requirements, established standards for both instructional programs and centers, and access to capital outlay funds.

To address these and other problems, a Child Development Task Force was appointed by the Chancellor in January, 1982 and charged with formulating recommendations to improve child development instruction and services. The Task Force will issue its preliminary report this fall.

Subsequently, staff will develop specific policy proposals in the form of an agenda item for the Board of Governors.

This item includes background information the Board will need to evaluate the Task Force's work. Topics covered are: Current Status of Child Development Services, Current Status of Child Development Instructional Programs, Rationale for Continued Development, Funding Sources, Roles of Three State Agencies, and Charge of the Child Development Task Force.

CURRENT STATUS OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS¹

For the purpose of this report, data on three types of child development centers will be presented. While these categories may oversimplify somewhat the diversity of child development centers in California's community colleges, grouping the centers into categories is helpful. These three kinds of centers are:

1. *lab schools:*

child development programs established primarily to serve as settings for teacher education and training; the provision of care for children is considered incidental to the primary purpose of instruction. Historically, these programs have been located organizationally under the auspices of the instruction division.

2. *child care programs:*

child development programs which have as their primary focus the provision of care for the children of student parents to enable them to attend school. Though the provision of care may be useful for instructional purposes, instruction is considered incidental to the services function in a child care program. Historically, most of these programs have been located organizationally under the auspices of the student services division.

3. *combination programs:*

child development programs which have a dual focus on instruction and services; both functions are given approximately equal priority. Combination programs usually incorporate some very desirable characteristics from both the services and instruction program types. From the services perspective, combination programs have typically given priority to low income students and maintained longer hours than lab schools to meet the needs of students. From the instruction perspective, combination programs usually have a strong educational component for children for purposes of developing a model curriculum, and have included practicum opportunities for students with a master teacher present.

The data contained in this section of the report are based primarily upon survey results gathered during the 1980-81 academic year. The survey instrument itself was originally developed and administered by the Higher Education Consortium, a policy advisory group under the auspices of the Office of Child Development in the State Department of Education. The survey was originally limited to the study of campus child care facilities. A subsequent mailing of questionnaires and series of telephone interviews by Jan Hake, an intern from U.C. Davis, expanded the target population to include all types of child development services and instruction programs operated by the colleges.

Number and Types of Centers

Eighty (75 percent) of the community colleges in California currently have some type of child development center; 27 (25 percent) of the colleges have no center at all.

Of the 80 colleges having child development centers, 42 (39 percent) of the colleges have combination centers, 21 (20 percent) have child care centers, nine (eight percent) have lab school programs and nine (eight percent) have more than one type of center, e.g. a separate lab school and a separate child care center. There are a total of 106 centers on 80 college campuses.

Children and Families Served in Child Development Centers

During 1980-81, 6,235 families have enrolled 6,915 children in child development centers. Eighty-seven percent of these children are from student families, one percent are children of staff and one percent are children of faculty members. In addition, 11 percent of the enrolled children are from nonstudent families from the surrounding community. Some of the reasons that nonstudent families are included in child development centers are: to add handicapped children, add abused and neglected children, and to add linguistic and cultural diversity to the center. Children of nonstudent families are included in state-funded centers only after all student families have been served. A closer look at the student parents in state-funded centers reveals that 83 percent are low income, 37 percent are minority, 48 percent are single parents and 45 percent receive AFDC or other forms of public assistance. Also 78 percent of the children on waiting lists in state-funded programs are from low income families. The implications of these statistics are obvious for the promotion of gender equity, affirmative action and equal educational opportunity.

Most of the children being served are 3-6 years old (68 percent), only five percent are under two, 24 percent are from 2-3 years old, and three percent are over age six. One of the main reasons that there are so few child development centers for infants is that infant care is much more expensive to provide, compared to other forms of child care, due to the high adult-child ratios which are required. The hours per week that children are enrolled in the programs are: 25.5 percent are enrolled 1-10 hours per week, 30 percent are enrolled 11-20 hours per week, 28.5 percent are enrolled 21-30 hours per week and 17 percent are enrolled 30 or more hours per week. This distribution reflects the flexible scheduling of campus child development programs; center staff are able to accommodate students' varied schedules.

Characteristics of Child Development Centers

Most child development centers provide a comprehensive range of developmental experiences for the children enrolled in their centers. While not every component is actually used by each family, all state-funded programs are required to provide the services listed. The services available to children and families as well as the percentage of centers which provide that service are as follows:

Services	(N=80)	Percent of programs Providing Services
1. <u>Parent education and involvement</u> - often includes a parent advisory committee at each program.		95%
2. <u>Nutrition services</u> - typically includes the provision of a well-balanced meal and nutritious snacks each day, as well as nutrition education for parents and children.		88%
3. <u>Health services</u> - usually includes health screening and preventive health measures as well as follow-up and treatment through referral to appropriate health care agencies, physicians, or dentists.		62%
4. <u>Special needs</u> - o Instruction for limited-English-speaking and non-English-speaking children o Multicultural awareness o Care and development for handicapped children		31% 67% 43%
5. <u>Social services</u> - usually includes the identification of additional child and family needs with a referral to other appropriate agencies.		40%
6. <u>Staff development</u> - typically includes a continuous program of in-service training for the staff of the child development program.		*
7. <u>Educational</u> - concerns promotion of the cognitive, social, and psychomotor skills that will be of benefit as the child progresses through the school system. Activities are generally tailored to meet each child's individual needs and developmental age.		*

* Exact percentage unknown.

The number of hours per day that child development programs are open varies depending on the type of program. Lab schools tend to be open fewer hours per day (61.5 percent are open five or fewer hours) compared to child care centers (85 percent are open nine or more hours per day) and combination centers (65 percent are open nine or more hours). No laboratories are open nine or more hours per day.

Fifty-nine percent of the colleges indicated that they provided child development services during summer session. Many people responding to the survey voiced grave doubts as to the future viability of summer child development programs because of fiscal cutbacks; thus the number of programs currently operating during summer session may be significantly less than what was reported at the time the survey was taken.

Adequacy of Existing Centers

Even though child development centers exist on 80 community college campuses, there is evidence that they are not meeting the current need for service. Only nine percent of the programs reported that they were able to serve all students who wanted to enroll their child in a child development program; 82 percent of the colleges indicated that they were not able to accommodate all students. Indeed, the vast majority of child development centers are filled to capacity and have long waiting lists. There are 4,390 known students on waiting lists (approximately 47 families per program). This number obviously does not include those applicants desiring admission to programs which do not maintain a waiting list, nor does it reflect the potential number of applicants in need of care for infants, toddlers and school-aged children, but for whom such programs are largely unavailable. The overall average waiting period was five months or approximately one semester. Twenty-one percent of the programs reported waiting periods of one year or longer; however, the wait period for some programs was over two and one half years, ironically rendering the children too old for such programs. Thus, the number of openings available for children within a reasonable period of time falls far short of that desired by student parents in need of child care.

In addition, there are critical gaps between program need and available service for certain types of children and programs. For example, only 21 colleges (20 percent) provide infant care, eight (eight percent) colleges provide evening care and only two colleges operate after-school programs designed for school age children. No colleges provide care for sick children. Thus, infants, toddlers, sick children and those in need of extended day and evening care are notably underserved in child development programs in California's community colleges. In addition, community colleges are not able to train their students about how to provide these important types of child development programs because there are so few model centers on the community college campuses.

STATUS OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Definition of "Child Development Instruction Programs"

Child development instruction programs are approved curricular programs at community colleges leading to a certificate and/or an AA or an AS degree. Child development instruction programs are designed to train students to become directors, teachers or paraprofessionals in programs for young children, including publicly and privately funded preschools and child care centers, Head Start, Children's Centers and family day care homes. Instruction programs provide students with (1) an understanding of the theory and research in child development, and (2) practical field experiences which include direct work with children.

Relationship Between Child Development Instruction and Services

An important relationship exists between child development instruction and child development services. Students in the instructional program are usually placed in child development centers for their practicum experience. Direct work with children in a child development center is considered to be an essential part of a student's training to become a teacher in a children's program. In fact, laboratory schools are set up solely for this reason. The on-campus child development center serves as a demonstration center, where students can observe exemplary early childhood teaching and practice such methods themselves. On several campuses the faculty member responsible for teaching child development also administer the child development center or are actively involved in the supervision of the students working in the center. Thus, on many colleges, a close working relationship rather than strict separation of child development services and instructional personnel often exists.

Child Development Certificate/Degree Options

Community college instructional programs have been designed to offer the student the following options:

- (1) a 20 to 40-unit child development certificate that prepares the student to work under supervision in most preschool, nursery school, child care, and Head Start programs.
- (2) a 60 to 65-unit AA degree with a major in child development. This qualifies the student for a Children's Center Permit issued by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.

The graduate of a child development instruction program will have acquired the foundation for a philosophy of teaching, a broad base of knowledge of child development theory from birth through adolescence, and special competence in working with children in at least one age span (infant/toddler, pre-primary, or primary school age). The program integrates relevant principles from several disciplines into both general education and professional studies.

Number of Colleges Offering Child Development Instruction Programs

In 1979, the Chancellor's Office issued a report that indicated that 95 colleges (93 percent) offer courses in child development instruction.² A typical community college offers about twelve courses. Colleges not offering courses tended to be either small colleges or campuses of multicollge districts where child development instruction was given at another college in the district. The range of courses offered appeared to correlate with college size. The largest course offerings were in the big urban colleges and also in colleges where strong leadership in child development was known to exist.

Student Enrollment in Child Development

The actual student enrollment in all child development courses in the California Community Colleges has been an elusive figure because child development is taught in so many different academic disciplines. The 1979 study of child development instruction programs identified 25 general administrative headings supervising child development departments in the community colleges. It is known that some child development instruction is listed under "home economics" and some under "early childhood education." In spite of this, the study estimated the number of college students enrolled in child development classes on a statewide basis to be 28,945. Students in child development constitute 8.8 percent of "full-time" enrollment. The number of student majors is 8,923 (31.8 percent of total enrollment in the program.) Of those who do major, 3,182 graduate (11 percent of total enrollment in the program). Many students enroll in child development classes to obtain background in child development when majoring in other subject matter areas. Illustrative are student nurses and parents who desire additional information for rearing their children.

Regardless of the measure used, whether number of students, number of courses taught, number of colleges with child development programs, or the proportion of courses in relationship to the total curriculum, child development programs constitute a substantial block of instruction in the California Community Colleges. Child development is a significant and growing educational area, with marked influence ranging from occupational training, to effective parenthood for strengthening the family unit.

RATIONALE FOR CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT

One quarter of all community colleges in California do not currently have a child development center. The reasons include: lack of money for facilities and/or program operations, philosophical objection to the provision of campus child care, lack of understanding about the relation of child development centers to instruction, and lack of knowledge of the academic foundation of child development.

The De La Cruz Case

An important lawsuit created a legal rationale for providing child development services. In De La Cruz vs. Tormey, a group of low income mothers sued the San Mateo Community College District charging that the district's restriction of efforts to provide child care deprived them of equal educational opportunity. The case began in 1974, when students became interested in the subject of child care and decided to conduct a survey about the need for child care on their campus. The survey indicated that over a thousand students needed child care. Subsequently, a proposal was developed and presented to the Board of Trustees, but it was rejected. The next step occurred in 1976 when a faculty member agreed to apply on her own for funds to support a campus child care center. The State Department of Education awarded \$20,000 to the San Mateo Community College District, but the district Board of Trustees voted not to accept the money.

The suit charged that illegal sex discrimination existed not only because of the lack of child care facilities on the campus, but also because the college refused to apply for state or federal funds to set up such centers. The court ruled that maintaining a policy and practice of (1) refusing to allow child care facilities, (2) refusing to apply for or accept funds for child care facilities, and (3) refusing to allow community college district funds to be used for child care purposes could constitute violations of the student's rights to be free from sex discrimination in educational programs receiving federal monies (Title IX) and violations of the student's rights of equal protection under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

The De La Cruz decision clearly stated that the plaintiffs had adequately proven a discriminatory impact:

"There can be little doubt that a discriminatory effect, as that term is properly understood and has been used by the Supreme Court, has been adequately alleged. The concrete human consequences flowing from the lack of sufficient child care facilities, presents very practical impediments to beneficial participation in the District's educational programs, and are asserted to fall overwhelmingly on women students and would-be students."³

De La Cruz eventually settled out of court on October 23, 1980, with terms that included the agreement of the San Mateo Community College District to seek funding from both public and private sources for child care for all its campuses. The significance of this case for the Board of Governors and the 27 colleges which do not currently have child development centers is that subsequent court decisions also could find that the purposeful neglect of child care on community college campuses is a violation of Title IX and the student's right of equal protection under the 14th Amendment and require the Board of Governors or individual community college districts to seek funds to provide child care.

Promotion of Gender Equity and Programs for Displaced Homemakers and Reentry Women

As was noted in the discussion of the De La Cruz case, when a community college purposefully avoids providing child development services, a discriminatory impact against women has been shown to exist. Conversely, when colleges do provide child development services, they indicate their commitment to the achievement of gender equity and programs which support reentry women and displaced homemakers. Every report which has been written on the attainment of gender equity recommends that child care be provided.

For example, in 1979 the California Community and Junior College Association's (CCJCA) Commission on Women conducted two full-day hearings for the purpose of determining the needs of present and potential women students of the California community colleges. Child care was "the most frequently mentioned, most critical, and most unmet need" mentioned during the testimony. Many people testified that child care is essential if colleges are to help women become educated and self-supporting as opposed to unskilled and dependent. Another major concern expressed during the hearings was that since the passage of Proposition 13, some child development centers are closing or their existence is severely threatened by lack of funds.

The CCJCA report, which resulted from the testimony, recommends that "the budget of each community college district include adequate funding for child care for women students, day and evening, full and part-time," and that the "California Community and Junior College Association monitor and/or sponsor legislation which will insure adequate funding for that purpose."⁴

The recently released study on "The Needs of Displaced Homemakers," which was done by the California State Department of Education, similarly mentioned the provision of child care as being critical to help displaced homemakers enter the labor market. "Forty-two percent of displaced homemakers have an annual household income of under \$5,000. Most of these women would need financial or other in-kind help (e.g. free child care) during a job development or training period."⁵

In short, the provision of child development services has spillover effects that assist in achieving other Board of Governors' objectives for Community Colleges: gender equity and support of displaced homemakers and reentry women.

Promotion of Affirmative Action and Equal Educational Opportunity for Minority Students

The California Postsecondary Education Commission stated in a progress report on student affirmative action that "lack of quality child development programs is a primary factor in the underrepresentation of minorities and women in higher education."⁶ Child care is most problematic for minority women who constitute a high percentage of both single parent families and families with incomes below the poverty level. Too frequently, the high cost or lack of child care bars these women from the postsecondary education or training that might enable them to become economically self sufficient and independent of public welfare.

Thirty-seven percent of the children participating in state-funded community college child development programs are from minority student families. Minority students currently comprise 26 percent of the overall community college population; thus minority students are represented in a higher percentage in child development centers than in the student population as a whole. By providing child development centers, colleges demonstrate a commitment to equal educational opportunities for minority students.

Practicum Opportunities for Child Development Students

All of the lab schools and 91 percent of the combination child development programs in community colleges provide practicum or training opportunities for child development students. Fifty-two percent of child care programs also reported providing practicum or training opportunities for child development students. The child observation and teaching experience offered by child development centers for early childhood students contributes to a high quality child development instruction program.

Early childhood educators universally support the importance of laboratory training as a concurrent requirement with classroom preparation of students majoring in child development. As was pointed out earlier, it is important for students to have a first-hand experience with children in a child development center to prepare them for proper teaching of children. Campus child development centers allow faculty to control the curriculum in the center, provide opportunities for students to exercise responsibilities and experiment with instructional techniques, and also provide for the analysis and exchange of ideas related to field experiences. On-campus child development programs provide an opportunity for continuous supervision of students working in the centers. Faculty can assess the teaching performance of students and provide feedback to students regarding areas in which they need improvement. Thus, students participating in a field placement on campus are likely to have a much richer academic experience than if the center didn't exist.

Instructional and Research Opportunities for Students from Disciplines Other Than Child Development

Child development centers are used by many other instructional disciplines besides child development. Over 97 percent of community colleges having child development centers reported that students from the following disciplines used the center for instructional experiences: nursing, psychology, anthropology, dental hygiene, nutrition, physical education, sociology, home economics, photography, art, music and family and consumer education. In addition to training opportunities, 67 percent of all child development centers indicated that they provided research opportunities for students and faculty.

Employee Benefit for Faculty and Staff

While the primary uses of a child development center are for student parents and students studying child development, it can also benefit the community college by extending the child development services to faculty and staff and thus benefit the college in the following ways:

- o Reduce difficulties in arranging faculty schedules by enabling faculty with small children to teach classes at a variety of times, including early morning, late afternoon, and evening.
- o Attract and retain competent employees for secretarial, maintenance, food service, and administrative positions. A campus child development program could function as an employee benefit which reduces absenteeism and employee turnover.

FUNDING SOURCES⁷

Community colleges have used a variety of sources of funds to support their 106 child development centers, including one or more of the following:

State Department of Education/Office of Child Development SDE/ OCD)

A major source of funds for community college child development centers in California is the State Department of Education's Office of Child Development. Fifty-one (48 percent) of the 106 centers on community college campuses receive \$3,064,497 in state general fund (campus child care) money through the Department of Education and are therefore subject to that agency's policies, regulations and guidelines. Besides campus child care funds, five additional community colleges receive a total of \$1,000,809 in noncampus child development funds (general child care, state preschool and resource and referral).

Community College Child Development Tax Bail Out Funds

Twenty-eight community college districts chose to levy a Child Development Permissive Tax prior to 1978, and now receive local assistance funds from the State in the amount of \$3,477,000 to support the operational costs associated with 59 (56 percent) of the child development centers. Forty-one (39 percent) of the 106 centers receive SDE/OCD funds in addition to their "bail out" money, whereas 18 (17 percent) of the centers receive bail out funds only. Although these 18 centers receive their bailout money from SDE/OCD, they are not under contract with SDE/OCD and thus are subject only to local district policies.

District Funds

Thirty-seven (35 percent) of the community colleges chose to use district funds as a primary form of support for their child development centers. Many other districts use district funds as a secondary form of support to supplement child development centers funded by OCD and bail out funds. District-funded centers have not been subject to any statewide regulations or guidelines. It has been difficult to obtain accurate information on these centers because no state mandates exist to require them to submit reports.

The exact amount of money that districts are contributing to child development centers is not known. Part of the reason for this is the overlap between child development services and instruction programs which was discussed earlier. In a combination program, it is difficult to know how much of the combination program's costs are allocated to the services function and how much to the instruction function.

District Match

In order to receive their State SDE/OCD contract funds, seventeen community college districts are required to provide a 25 percent local match from district funds. The statewide match requirement is \$468,959. This match requirement is a vestige from the early 70's when these child care centers were funded from federal dollars on a 75:25 matching basis. The continued matching requirement is inequitable in two ways: first, other types of federally funded child care programs do not require a local match; and second, districts that established programs subsequent to the changeover from federal funding are not required to provide a local match to receive State funds. Several attempts have been made to eliminate the requirement in an effort to attain greater equity. The state control agencies have insisted on keeping the requirement to assure that community college districts will maintain their effort and serve the same number of children as they have in the past. At the same time, no new state dollars have been available to "buy out" this requirement.

Parent Fees

All OCD funded programs and almost all of the other community college child development centers charge parent fees for the use of the child development center. This source of funds usually constitutes a small part (less than ten percent) of the overall budget of the centers because most parents qualify for state subsidies since their incomes are so low.

Miscellaneous Sources of Funds

In addition to the funds mentioned above, districts also receive associated student body funds, private donations, Child Care Food Program monies and money earned through fund raising activities such as bake sales to augment their budgets. CETA, work study, and WIN were also reported as sources of funds which provide additional staff in the centers.

Summary of Funding Source Information

<u>Type of Funding</u>	<u># Centers Funded (%)</u>
SDE/OCD fund only	10 (9%)
Bail out funds only	18 (17%)
District only	37 (35%)
Combination (SDE/Bail out and District)	41 (39%)
	106 (100%)

ROLES OF THREE STATE AGENCIES INVOLVED IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The responsibility for the development and maintenance of early childhood education and child development programs and centers in California community colleges is divided among several agencies - the Department of Social Services, the Department of Education and the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges. This overlapping authority has led to some uncertainty on the part of child development center personnel as to which agency has the ultimate responsibility for approval of programs, establishment of standards and overall statewide leadership.

Role of Department of Education (SDE)

In 1972 the California Legislature passed the Child Development Act (Assembly Bill 99, Chapter 670, Statutes of 1972). This act consolidated all state-administered child development programs under the administration of the Department of Education. The Act specified:

"The Department of Education is hereby designated as the single state agency responsible for the promotion, development and provision of care of children in the absence of their parents....."
(Education Code Section 8206).

In addition to its broad responsibilities under Section 8206, the Department of Education is also given authority to establish the following: educational standards for children's programs, credential and permit qualifications for child development staff, regulations for hours of enrollment, regulations pertaining to eligibility for and priority of services, and regulations pertaining to the formulation, promotion, approval and monitoring of child development centers.

Role of Department of Social Services (DSS)

Pursuant to the California Community Care Facilities Act (Health and Safety Code Sections 1500 - et seq.,) the Department of Social Services has regulatory authority and responsibilities for "community care facilities" (which include child care centers for children). Essentially, the legislation provides for the licensing and inspection of community care facilities by the Department of Social Services. The basic thrust of the legislation and regulations pertaining to community care facilities is towards insuring the health and safety of those who use them. In addition, the Department has promulgated regulations in Title 22 of the California Administrative Code which further specify the responsibilities of both community care facilities and the Department of Social Services.

Overlap of Regulatory Authority Between SDE and DSS

It was the Legislature's intent that the Department of Social Services and the Department of Education would have separate spheres of regulatory authority over child development centers. This intent is manifested by such provisions as Health and Safety Code Section 1528, which provides that Department of Social Services evaluations of child care facilities for children "shall be limited to health and safety considerations and shall not include any evaluations of the content of any educational or training program of the facility."

Despite the Legislature's attempt to define separate spheres of regulation, both SDE and DSS were monitoring child development centers using review processes which were quite similar. In an attempt to resolve this problem and eliminate duplication of effort, an Interagency Agreement has been executed annually between the State Department of Education and the State Department of Social Services. The agreement describes the responsibilities of the two state agencies for licensure of child development programs in California.

Specifically, it provides that the Department of Education will conduct compliance reviews using state licensing standards and issue a certificate which has the force and effect of a license to publicly funded child development programs under contract with the Department. SDE also conducts a program quality review with teams of child development consultants to assess program quality standards which exceed licensure standards.

The Department of Social Services retains the responsibility for licensure of any child development facility that does not have a contract with the Department of Education. Thus, community college child development centers which have a contract with SDE/OCD receive their "license" from the Department of Education. The regulatory responsibility for bail-out funded and district-funded child development centers is not as clear; consequently, SDE has licensed some centers, DSS has licensed other centers, and some centers have remained unlicensed. The Higher Education Consortium Survey revealed that on community college campuses, 85 percent of the combination programs were licensed, 77 percent of the child care centers were licensed and only 43 percent of lab schools were licensed.

To further complicate the situation, there has been some confusion about whether campus child development centers need to be licensed. Currently, there are no regulations on the subject. State policy was most recently outlined in a Department of Social Services policy memorandum dated July 3, 1981 which states:

"A child care training/demonstration laboratory operated as part of the curriculum of any university, college, junior college, or high school is exempt from licensure... This exemption also extends to laboratory schools operated at private educational institutions. Such programs typically provide "hands on" training to prospective preschool teachers and afford an opportunity for students in other related disciplines to observe child behavior. Child care programs operated on school campuses which are not training/demonstration laboratories and are not part of a school's curriculum shall be licensed."⁸

The memo specifies policy with regard to lab schools and child care centers but it does not specify a policy with respect to combination programs. Many child development experts believe that all community college child development centers should be licensed or at least meet licensing standards so that parents can be assured that the health and safety of their children are not in jeopardy. Unfortunately, when centers for which licensure is not required apply for licensure, it is often not possible to issue a license because of the shortage of licensing staff. To solve these problems, the recommendation of the Higher Education Consortium on this issue was:

"All campus child care and development facilities (including lab schools) shall be licensed according to the provisions of the California Administrative Code, Title 22. The California State Department of Education, Office of Child Development, should be given the responsibility for such licensing, and additional staff positions should be authorized for this purpose."⁹

Role of Board of Governors

The Board of Governors has traditionally played two roles in the area of child development: (1) approving child development instruction programs and courses, and (2) assisting with the planning of facilities through administering state funding under the Community College Construction Act. The first role has been routinely carried out by the Chancellor's Office Program Evaluation and Approvals Unit. The second role has had some historical complications.

The overall legislative intent of the Community College Construction Act is that state funding under the Act is permissible if the center is erected predominantly for instructional purposes. In the plans for capital construction, a district is required to relate the need for the facility to its plans for future academic programs. Thus, a district may seek state support for the construction of a child development center; however, before such state aid may be granted, the district must establish the existence of a legitimate and predominant instructional purpose for the facilities.

Child development centers have been constructed predominantly for instructional purposes (e.g. lab schools), for service needs (e.g. child care centers) or both through combination programs. While the policy for lab schools and child care centers is clear, there has been some confusion over the eligibility of combination child development centers for state money since they serve both instructional and services purposes. To complicate the situation even further, the Office of the Legislative Analyst (OLA) recommended that the State should not provide capital outlay funds for on-campus laboratories. OLA maintained that off-campus child development programs should be used for student training rather than on campus centers to save state funds.

In response to the Legislative Analyst's report, the Board of Governors, in April, 1978, adopted two position statements relating to capital outlay for child development (Board Action No. 780425):

Position Statement Regarding Child Care Centers

"Recognizing that large numbers of potential community college students are prevented from matriculating in community colleges because they are unable to obtain adequate child care services, and recognizing that it is in the state and national interest for those persons who need such services and who can profit from community college instruction to receive this type of assistance, the Board of Governors shall make every effort to obtain state and federal funding for adequate child care centers for the use of community college students. The colleges shall be required to exhaust all possible on-campus facilities before state funds for child care centers shall be approved by the Chancellor's Office."

Position Statement on Child Development Instruction Programs

"The Board of Governors continues to support the use of state funds to construct laboratories which are essential to the training of students enrolled in child development instructional programs. Correspondingly, it directs staff to continue recommending for approval proposed capital outlay projects for child development laboratories when these proposed projects are eligible under the Construction Act. The colleges shall be required to exhaust all possible on-campus facilities before state funds for instructional laboratories shall be approved by the Chancellor's Office."

These two statements constitute the only formal policy positions the Board has taken at this time in the area of child development.

CHARGE OF THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE

Currently, no comprehensive policy statement exists about community college child development in California. The policy statements which have been adopted by the Board of Governors to date relate primarily to child development facilities, and not to minimum standards or program quality guidelines for child development instruction and services programs.

The Board of Governors is now being asked to provide leadership in the area of child development and to chart the future policy direction of this area. Although the State Department of Education is the primary statutory state agency for child development services in California, it has no jurisdiction over child development instructional programs. As has been repeatedly pointed out in this paper, child development instruction and services programs are inextricably bound up together. A comprehensive policy statement which addresses both areas simultaneously needs to be developed. The Department of Education supports the development of such a statement and has, in fact, loaned a full-time staff person to the Chancellor's Office to assist with this effort.

To further this effort, a Child Development Instruction and Services Task Force was established by the Chancellor last January. The purpose of this Task Force is to serve as the primary vehicle for representatives of local community colleges to make recommendations to the Chancellor's Office about the future policy direction of child development services and instruction.

The Task Force has organized itself into subcommittees and is working in the following areas:

- o philosophy, goals, and objectives
- o minimum standards
- o program quality guidelines
- o funding mechanisms
- o other relevant areas, e.g., licensing, professional standards, coordination of instruction and services.

The Task Force is composed of various representatives of community colleges who are concerned with child development instruction and services including: students, members of Boards of Trustees, Superintendents/ Presidents, Deans of Instruction, Directors of Child Development Centers, Instructors of Child Development and others. Twenty-five community colleges are represented on the Task Force.

The Task Force has had three successful meetings to date and has developed over 40 policy recommendations; it is now in the process of refining its document. The report also contains statistical data which focuses on the status of existing programs as well as on the needs of community college students for additional child development instruction and services programs. At its fourth meeting in September, the Task Force will make revisions to its report. After that, the document will be sent to all community colleges and major associations for their comments.

At the completion of its work, the Task Force will submit its final report and policy recommendations to the Chancellor. Staff will review the report and recommendations and develop an item for presentation to the Board of Governors early in 1983.

Footnotes

1. Statistics in this portion of the item are drawn from the following sources:

Hake, Janet L., "Child Development Programs in California Community Colleges," (in press), Child Development Master's Thesis, University of California, Davis, 1982.

"Campus Child Care: A Challenge for the 80's", Field Evaluation Draft, Women's Reentry Project, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980.

"Annual Report - Child Care and Development Services," Sacramento, California: State Department of Education, Office of Child Development, 1977-78.

"Child Development Instruction and Services, Sacramento, CA: Board of Governors Report, 1978.

"Child Care and Development Services," Report of the Commission to Formulate a State Plan for Child Care and Development Services in California," Sacramento, CA: Office of Child Development, California State Department of Education, 1978.

2. Beck, J. Milton, "Status of Child Development Instruction Programs in California Community Colleges", Sacramento, CA: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, 1979.
3. De La Cruz vs. Torrey, 582 F 2d at 61.
4. Mitchen, Grace N., "The New Majority: The Educational Needs of Present and Future Women Students of the California Community Colleges", a report by the Commission on Women of the California Community and Junior College Association, Sacramento, CA, April 1979.
5. "The Needs of Displaced Homemakers in California", Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, 1982.
6. "Affirmative Action Progress Report", Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Commission, 1979.
7. Information for this section was provided by State Department of Education, Office of Child Development.
8. "Child Care Programs - Licensing Jurisdiction", memorandum to Dave Foster from Ronald Harmon, Sacramento, CA: Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division, July 3, 1981.
9. Campus Child Care and Development Services, Report of Higher Education Consortium; Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, 1981.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024